To: Berry, Laura[berry.laura@epa.gov]; Patulski, Meg[patulski.meg@epa.gov]

Cc: Dresser, Chris[Dresser.Chris@epa.gov]

From: Russ, Timothy

Sent: Thur 12/1/2016 3:38:20 PM

Subject: FW: Information Transmittal from FHWA/CDOT: I-70 East Project PM Hot-spot Modeling

Background Monitor

Hi Laura,

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Referred to FHWA

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

"Mon 6/20/2016 2:56 PM

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Hi Everyone,

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

EPA's November, 2015 PM Hot-spot modeling guidance ("Transportation Conformity Guidance for Quantitative Hot-spot Analyses in PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ Nonattainment and Maintenance Areas") notes the following in section 9.3.4 *24-hour PM₁₀ NAAQS*:

Calculating Design Values and Determining Conformity

The 24-hour PM₁₀ design value is calculated at each receptor by directly adding the sixth-highest modeled 24-hour concentrations (if using five years of meteorological data) to the appropriate monitor value for the 24-hour background concentration from three years of monitoring data, based on Exhibit 9-6. Exhibit 9-6: Monitor Value Used for Design Value Calculation

Number of Background	Monitor Value Used for
Concentration Values from	Design Value Calculation
the Monitor	
< 347	Highest Monitor Value
348 -695	Second Highest Value
696 -1042	Third Highest Value
1043 -1096	Fourth Highest Value

PM₁₀ data from the Commerce City monitoring site is provided in the table below:

EPA/OTAQ Table of Data

Year	Ν	Highest v	value 2 nd highest	3 rd highest	4 th highes	t
2013	357	144	97	93	89	
2012	308	113	86	76	75	
2011	351	82	65	64	61	

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Year	N	Highest value	2 nd highest	3 rd highest	4 th highest
2014	339	117	97	92	89
2013	357	144	97	93	89
2012	308	113	86	76	75

[&]quot;N" = the number of days of valid data recovery."

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks!

Tim

Tim Russ
Environmental Scientist
USEPA Region 8
Air Program
1595 Wynkoop Street (8P-AR)
Denver, CO 80202-1129
Ph. (303) 312-6479
Fax (303) 312-6064
e-mail: russ.tim@epa.gov

From: Berry, Laura

Sent: Thursday, December 01, 2016 6:47 AM

To: Russ, Timothy <Russ.Tim@epa.gov>; Patulski, Meg <patulski.meg@epa.gov>

Cc: Dresser, Chris < Dresser. Chris@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Information Transmittal from FHWA/CDOT: I-70 East Project PM Hot-spot

Modeling Background Monitor

So Tim, do we know what monitor value they're going to use for the background?

Laura Berry

(734) 214-4858

berry.laura@epa.gov

From: Russ, Timothy

Sent: Wednesday, November 30, 2016 10:54 AM

To: Berry, Laura < berry.laura@epa.gov >; Patulski, Meg < patulski.meg@epa.gov >

Cc: Dresser, Chris < <u>Dresser.Chris@epa.gov</u>>

Subject: Information Transmittal from FHWA/CDOT: I-70 East Project PM Hot-spot Modeling

Background Monitor

Hi Everyone,

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Thanks!

Tim

Tim Russ
Environmental Scientist
USEPA Region 8
Air Program
1595 Wynkoop Street (8P-AR)
Denver, CO 80202-1129
Ph. (303) 312-6479
Fax (303) 312-6064

e-mail: russ.tim@epa.gov

From: Horn, Chris (FHWA) [mailto:Chris.Horn@dot.gov]

Sent: Wednesday, November 30, 2016 7:21 AM

To: Russ, Timothy < Russ. Tim@epa.gov>; Houk, Jeff (FHWA) < Jeff. Houk@dot.gov>; Perritt,

Karen (FHWA) < Karen Perritt@dot.gov >; Henderson - CDOT, Vanessa

<vanessa.henderson@state.co.us>

Cc: Jackson, Scott < <u>Jackson.Scott@epa.gov</u>>; Patulski, Meg < <u>patulski.meg@epa.gov</u>>; Berry, Laura < <u>berry.laura@epa.gov</u>>; Dresser, Chris < <u>Dresser.Chris@epa.gov</u>>; Anderson, Carol < <u>Anderson.Carol@epa.gov</u>>; Odendahl, Steve < <u>Odendahl.Steve@epa.gov</u>>; Dubey, Susmita < <u>dubey.susmita@epa.gov</u>>; Denawa, Mai < <u>Denawa.Mai@epa.gov</u>>

Subject: RE: Information Transmittal to FHWA/CDOT: I-70 East Project PM Hot-spot

Modeling [WARNING: DKIM validation failed]

Tim,

As a follow up to your email dated 9/18/16 the project team has been consulting with CDPHE concerning the use of the La Casa air monitor. CDPHE has taken a hard look at the use of La Casa for us and they have concerns and issues with its use. Their primary issues, as extracted from the attached email, are:

- 1. La Casa is located on a little higher terrain outside of the Platte Valley, so wind flows related to sources can be different versus the Alsup/Commerce City site.
- 2. La Casa has little to no significant industrial activity nearby whereas the GES area does have nearby industrial activity, including Purina, Metro Denver Wastewater, Suncor Refinery and Xcel Cherokee. Alsup/Commerce City is downwind of these sources as well, so it better reflects the GES area.
- 3. The GES area has impacts from both I-25 and I-70, including the "mousetrap". Due to its topographically higher location to the west and wind patterns (see wind roses in our Annual Data Reports that show a predominant SW component) we do not believe that La Casa is fully picking up all the impacts from the existing highways.

Referred to FHWA

I will address your second concern under a separate email.

Chris Horn, PE

Senior Area Engineer

Colorado Division

Federal Highway Administration